UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/008,831	11/13/2001	Anna M. Arellano-Payne	40655.5600	8586

7590   05/23/2005

Thomas V. DelRosario
Snell & Wilmer L.L.P.
One Arizona Center
400 E. Van Buren
Phoenix, AZ 85004-2202

EXAMINER
DAS, CHAMELI

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2192	

DATE MAILED: 05/23/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/008,831	ARELLANO-PAYNE ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	CHAMELI C. DAS	2192	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _07 April 2005_.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-14_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-14_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED DESCRIPTION

1.   This action is in response to the RCE filed on 4/7/05.

2.   Claims 1-2, 10, 13-14 have been amended.

3.   Claims 1-14 have been rejected.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5.   Claims 1-6, 9-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Pettus, US 5,499,343 and further in view of Noy, US 6,795,851

As per claim 1, Pettus (US 5,499,343) discloses:

-   ***originating a request on a first computing platform for information***

    located on a second computing platform (Fig 15A, col 4, lines 49-59, "for

    implementing communication between application programs residing in client

    and server nodes ... server node"), where "client node" and "server node" are

    the "first computing platform" and "second computing platform", the request is

    the message is shown in (col 4 lines 60-66)

-   ***translating the request message at the first computing platform (col 17,***

    lines 37-49) and (col 9 lines 40-67), where "NSF interface formats the

request" is "translating the request message at the first computing platform

and , where the "request is formatted" means the request message is

translated as claimed

- ***transmitting the translated request message to the second computing***

platform (col 9 lines 61-67 and col 10 lines 1-2, "The service requests are

transferred from the CSF interface 630 to the object oriented NSF interface

640 as indicated schematically by arrow 635. As will also be described in

detail herein, the NSF interface formats the requests and otherwise

completes the transport path between the client node 610 and server node

650. Thereafter, the requests are forwarded to network adapter 645, as

indicated by arrow 42, and over communication channel 648 to the server

node 650.")

- ***translating the translated request message at the second computing***

platform into a format readable by the second computer (col 10, lines 3-

10, "At the server 650, the remote RPC request is received at the network

adapter 85 and passed to the NSF interface 680, as indicated by arrow 682.

The NSF interface 680 ***reformats the request*** and forwards it to the CSF

interface 670, as indicated by arrow 675. In response to the RPC, the CSF

interface 670 directs the request to an application program 652 for execution

of the service"), ***where reformats the request is "translating the translated***

request" as claimed. The server responses the request (col 10, lines 7-9

and col 10 lines 33-37) indicates the format readable by the second platform.

Pettus discloses the system provides object oriented environment (col 9 lines 54-56) that is independent of any class and protocol (col 14 lines 1-15). Pettus does not specifically disclose the " translate the message into platform independent language". However, Noy (US 6,795,851) discloses "translate the message into platform independent language" (Noy, col 2, lines 46-54), where the requests are translated into the Java script, and Java is a platform independent language. The modification would be obvious because one of the ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to provide an environment which is suitable for distributed network applications which has different types of computers and platforms.

As per claim 2, Pettus discloses the system provides object oriented environment (col 9 lines 54-56) that is independent of any class and protocol (col 14 lines 1-15). Pettus does not specifically disclose a formatting markup language. However, Noy discloses the mark up language (Noy col 7, lines 22-25). The modification would be obvious because formatting markup language lets developers and designers create customized tags that offer greater flexibility in organizing and presenting information in the Web.

As per claim 3, Pettus discloses:

-      **accessing the requested information on the second platform** (col 4, lines 50-60)

-   **translating the requested** information (col 9, lines 61-67, col 10, lines 62-66, col 17, lines 39-43)

- transmitting the requested information to the first platform (col 10, lines 3-10).

Pettus does not specifically disclose "platform independent language."
However, Noy (US 6,795,851) discloses "translate the message into platform independent language" (Noy, col 2, lines 46-54), where the requests are translated into the Java script, and Java is a platform independent language. The modification would be obvious because one of the ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to provide an environment which is suitable for distributed network applications which has different types of computers and platforms.

As per claim 4, Pettus discloses:

- translating the requested information to a format readable on the first platform and using the requested information on the first platform (col 17 lines 57-67 and col 18, lines 1-10), where "the request packet is reformatted" clearly indicates that requested message has translated and sent to the destination address, the packet contains the data request (col 13 lines 33-35, "copies the data request into a packet") and the request is formatted is shown in col 17 lines 40-41, "issues a request that is formatted).

   Pettus does not specifically disclose "platform independent language."
   However, Noy (US 6,795,851) discloses "translate the message into platform independent language" (Noy, col 2, lines 46-54), where the requests are translated into the Java script, and Java is a platform independent language. The modification would be obvious because one of the ordinary skill in the art

would be motivated to provide an environment which is suitable for distributed

network applications which has different types of computers and platforms.

As per claim 5, Pettus does not specifically disclose HTTP. However,

Noy discloses HTTP (col 7, lines 21-25). The modification would be obvious

because one of the ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to transport

request and response between the distributed client and server used on the

Web.

As per claim 6, the background section of Pettus discloses secure

transmission (Pettus, col 3 lines 60-62), where "reliable" data transport

between client and server" indicates the secure transmission. Noy

discloses HTTP transmission (Noy col 7 lines 21-25). The modification would

be obvious because one of the ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to

provide a reliable environment for data transmission between networks.

Regarding claim 9 (Pettus, col 12, lines 21-34).

Regarding claim 10 (Pettus, abstract, Figure 15A, col 4, lines 49-59, col 9, lines

50-60, col 17, lines 1-10).

Regarding claim 11 (Pettus, col 9, lines 61-67, col 10, lines 62-66, col 17, lines

39-43 and col 19, lines 2-4, col 17, lines 58-67, col 18, lines 11-21).

Regarding claim 12 (Pettus, abstract).

Regarding claim 13, (Pettus, col 6 lines 20-45) and (Noy col 7, lines 22-25).

As per claim 14, Pettus discloses:

- receiving a request for information (col 4, lines 49-59, col 9, lines 50-60, col 17, lines 1-10)

- parsing said request into one or more different fields of information (abstract, lines 4-8), where service requests are in different field like communications, printing etc. (col 8, lines 55-63), the service requests format and reformat (col 10, lines 3-10, *column 17, lines 41-42*) inherently including parsing the request as claimed.

Pettus does not specifically disclose mark up language format. However, Noy discloses the mark up language format (Noy col 7, lines 22-25). The modification would be obvious because formatting markup language lets developers and designers create customized tags that offer greater flexibility in organizing and presenting information in the Web.

6.   Claims 7-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pettus, US 5,499,343 and further in view of Nakagawa et al (US 6,530,025)

As per claim 7, Pettus discloses transmitting steps uses protocols. Pettus does not specifically disclose *authentication information for access as claimed*. However, Nakagawa discloses authentication information for access as claimed (Nakagawa, col 3, lines 48-55, col 4, lines 6-36). The modification would be obvious because one of the ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to provide a reliable environment for data transmission between networks.

As per claim 8, Pettus discloses transmitting steps uses protocols. Pettus does not specifically disclose *authentication information comprises a user identification and a password.* However, Nakagawa discloses authentication *information comprises a user identification and a password.* (Nakagawa, col 4, lines 6-26). The modification would be obvious because one of the ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to provide a secure and reliable environment for data transmission between networks.

Response to the argument

7.   The applicant's argument filed on 4/7/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In the Remarks, the applicant has argued in substance:

(1)   Pettus does not modify the request, but instead, modifies packet.

Response:

(1)   Pettus discloses a system for delivering the requested message (col 5 lines 11-18), the requested message are in a packet (col 13, lines 33-34, "copies the data requests into a packet) and the request (requested message) is translated (modified) is shown in column 17, lines 41-42, "issues a request that is formatted".

(2)   Pettus only reformats packets, not message.

Response:

(2)   Pettus discloses reformats request (col 10, 5-6, "The NSF interface reformats the request and forwards it to the CSF interface, this request is a message (col 4 lines 60-67)

Conclusion

8.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure.

TITLE: Method and apparatus in a data processing system for the issuance and delivery

of lightweight requests to concurrent and multiple service providers, US 6886170 B1

TITLE: Sending a view event, and a request event having a class name and a method

name, US 6748570 B1

TITLE: Method for verifying context between multiple related XML tags in document

object model (DOM), US 6718516 B1

TITLE: System and method for providing interpreter applications access to server

resources in a distributed network, US 6496865 B1.

9.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Chameli Das whose telephone number is 571-272-3696

       The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 7:00 A.M. to 3:30

P.M.

       If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

              supervisor Tuan Dam can be reached at 571-272-3695. The fax number

       for this group is (703) 872-9306.

       An inquiry of general nature or relating to the status of this application or

proceeding should be directed to the group receptionist whose telephone number is

703-305-9600.

Chameli C-Das

CHAMELI C. DAS
PRIMARY EXAMINER

5/19/05